

August 7, 2026

SUBJECT: FY27 Request for Proposals “Small Business Technical Assistance Grant Program – Capacity Building”

Addendum and Amendment No. 3

To All Interested Parties:

Please be advised that the following questions have been received since the release of Addendum and Amendment No. 2 and are addressed below. The question period related to the FY27 RFP for SBTA Program – Capacity Building is now closed.

Questions	Responses
Would [organization] be eligible to participate as a subcontractor or technical partner under a Massachusetts-based Lead organization, with the Lead serving as the Contractor/fiscal agent as described in the RFP's multi-party provision?	Without specific information related to the services you provide, where they are provided and/or where your organization is based, we cannot speak to your eligibility. Pages 6 and 7 of the RFP outlines required qualifications, which are applicable to the Lead applicant, and any other parties, vendors and subcontractors.
If so, are there any specific requirements or documentation needed to formalize that partnership structure in the proposal?	Specific eligibility and proposal requirements are detailed on Pages 6 and 7 of the RFP
Is there a minimum threshold for what portion of program delivery must be led or performed by the Massachusetts-based Lead versus subcontracted partners?	No, but the applicant and all participating parties must meet the required qualifications listed on Pages 6 and 7 of the RFP.
Team structure: Is MassDevelopment open to a lead applicant partnering with subcontractors to cover different curriculum pathways (e.g., a lead organization handling leadership development/EI, paired with named partners covering financial management, loan packaging, or CDFI principles)? Or is the preference for one organization delivering the full curriculum in-house?	The incorporation of subcontractors (various parties, vendors or otherwise) into proposed curriculum pathways is at the discretion of the applicant. The Agency has no stated preference.
Curriculum breadth: Given the three required pathways (TA competencies, leadership development, and CDFI principles), is it more competitive to demonstrate full coverage across all three, or would a proposal that goes deeper on one or two pathways while bringing in credible partners for the others still be considered strong?	While the RFP encourages a range of learning pathways, it does not specify that one approach is preferred over another. Proposals should demonstrate how they will provide meaningful coverage of the required priority areas, whether through in-house expertise, partnerships, or a combination of both.
Cohort structure: With a minimum of 10 participants per cohort noted in the RFP, do you have a general expectation for how many cohorts should run over the course of FY27, or is that left entirely to the applicant's proposed design?	The number of cohorts proposed to run over the course of FY27 is left to an applicant's proposed design.
Delivery format: Is virtual or hybrid delivery acceptable for reaching BSOs across the state, or is in-person delivery preferred/required for some or all sessions?	Applicants should respond with the delivery model(s) they consider most advantageous to advancing the goals, outcomes and impact described in the RFP.

Appendix A, the Scope of Work Template, is referenced on page 8 but isn't included in the RFP file I downloaded. Is it available as a separate document?	It is available as a separate document on MassDevelopment's website next to the RFP file: https://www.massdevelopment.com/rfps-and-rfqs
The final report is due June 11, 2027, but program delivery isn't required to be complete until June 30, 2027 — 19 days later. Should the final report's outcome data cover only activity through June 11, or do you expect a supplemental submission for the remaining three weeks of delivery?	The final report, due June 11, 2027, should include all activities; all activities should conclude by June 11, 2027.
For proposals involving multiple parties, who needs to demonstrate the required qualifications and examples of previous training: the Lead alone, the team collectively, or each named party individually?	All parties named as a lead, party, vendor and/or subcontractor in the applicant's RFP response need to demonstrate the required qualifications.
Is this award meant to complement capacity-building offerings already available to SBTA and CDFI grantees, or to establish a separate program?	The purpose of the RFP is outlined on page 2 of the RFP.